

**Reminder:** We need to develop a response to the following summary of the public comments received on landslides. We need to make sure we strengthen our rationale to address any apparent weaknesses the public pointed out in our proposed findings.

**Comment:** Some commenters acknowledged that landslides caused by logging practices such as clear cutting are a real problem in Oregon and additional management measures are necessary to address these impacts. It was noted that Oregon does not have sufficient programs in place to control non-point pollution from forestry practices, particularly due to logging on private lands.

Others expressed their disagreement with the federal agencies' recent decision and argued that the evidence provided by the federal entities was misleading, only focusing on "landslide density relationships" rather than considering the "total number of landslides triggered during major storms". If consider the latter, one would see that the "potential increases in sediment delivery to public resources from landslides...is proportionally small". In addition, it was argued that EPA has not offered objective evidence that additional management measures are needed to maintain water quality. It was recommended that EPA consider a broader scale view over longer timeframes to evaluate whether water quality and designated uses are impaired. The commenter added that the federal agencies have not produced any evidence that landslides resulting from forest management activities have caused exceedances in water quality or negatively impacted aquatic life.

## Forestry - Landslide Rationale

Oregon proposes to address this element of the additional management measures for forestry condition through a mix of regulatory and voluntary approaches. While the state has adopted more protective forestry rules to reduce landslide risks to life and property and promotes some voluntary practices to reduce landslide risks through the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds (The Oregon Plan), Oregon still does not have additional management measures for forestry in place to protect high-risk landslide areas to ensure that water quality standards and designated uses are achieved.

Since receiving conditional approval on January 13, 1998, Oregon amended the Oregon FPA rules to require the identification of landslide hazard areas in timber harvesting plans and road construction and placed certain restrictions on harvest and road activities within these designated high-risk landslide areas for public safety (OAR 629-623-0000 through 629-623-0800). However, under these amendments, shallow, rapidly moving landslide hazards directly related to forest practices are addressed only as they relate to risks for losses of life and property, not for potential water quality impacts. Oregon still allows timber harvest and the construction of forest roads, where alternatives are not available, on high-risk landslide hazard areas as long as it is not deemed a public safety risk.

In addition to these regulatory programs, Oregon employs a voluntary measure under the Oregon Plan that gives landowners credit for leaving standing live trees along landslide-prone areas as a source of large wood. The large wood, which may eventually be deposited into fish-

bearing stream channels, contributes to stream complexity, a key limiting factor for coastal coho salmon recovery. While this is a good management practice, the measure is not designed to protect high-risk erosion areas but rather to ensure large wood is available to provide additional stream complexity when a landslide occurs.

As noted in the January 13, 1998, findings, timber harvests on unstable, steep terrain can result in increases in landslide rates which contribute to water quality impairments. A number of studies continue to show significant increases in landslide rates after clear cutting compared to unmanaged forests in the Pacific Northwest. For example, Robinson et. al. (1999) found that in three out of four areas studied in very steep terrain, landslide densities and erosion volumes were greater in stands that were clear-cut during the previous nine years.<sup>2</sup> Other evidence indicates that timber harvests on unstable, steep terrain can result in increases in landslide rates of approximately 200 to 400 percent.<sup>3</sup>

Research by Montgomery et. al. (2000), and Turner et. al. (2010) is also consistent with this finding that timber harvest increases landslide rates. Montgomery et. al. (2000) concluded that landslide rates in Mettman Ridge in the Oregon Coast Range increased after clear cutting at a rate of three to nine times the background rate for the region. The regional analysis from the Mettman Ridge study found that forest clearing dramatically accelerates shallow landsliding in steep terrain typical of the Pacific Northwest.<sup>5</sup> Turner et al. (2010), also found that rain fall intensity, slope steepness, and stand age contributed to landslide rates. Very few landslides occurred when rainfall was less than or equal to a 100-year rainfall event and at higher rainfall intensities, steep slopes had significantly higher landslide densities compared to lower gradient slopes. In addition, they found that at higher rainfall intensities, the density of landslides in recently harvested sites was roughly two to three times the landslide density in older stands.<sup>6</sup>

Other research has examined the role of root cohesion on landslide susceptibility in forested landscapes. Root cohesion is a measure of the lateral reinforcing strength the root system provides.<sup>7</sup> The higher the root cohesion, the better the root system can stabilize the soil, reducing the risk of landslides. Schmidt et. al. (2001) found that median lateral root cohesion is less for industrial forests with significant understory and deciduous vegetation (6.8–23.2 kPa) compared to natural forests dominated by conifers (25.6–94.3 kPa). In clearcuts, Schmidt et. al. found that lateral root cohesion is uniformly less than or equal to 10 kPa, making these areas much more susceptible to landslide.

Sakals and Sidle (2004) modeled the effect of different harvest methodologies on root cohesion over time.<sup>8</sup> They found that, of the methodologies examined, (clear cutting, single tree selection

---

<sup>2</sup>Robison, G.R., Mills, K.A., Paul, J. Dent, L. and A. Skaugset. 1999. Oregon Department of Forestry Storm Impacts and Landslides of 1996: Final Report. Oregon Department of Forestry Forest Practices Monitoring Program. Forest Practices Technical Report Number 4.157 pages.

<sup>3</sup> Grant, G.E., “Review of NMFS/ODF White Papers”, February 25, 1997

<sup>5</sup> Montgomery, D. R., K. M. Schmidt, H. M. Greenberg & W. E. Dietrich, 2000. Forest clearing and regional landsliding. *Geology* 28: 311–314.

<sup>6</sup> Turner, T.R., Duke, S.D., Fransen, B.R., Reiter, M.L., Kroll, A.J., Ward, J.W., Bach, J.L., Justice, T. E., and R.E. Bilby. 2010. Landslide densities associated with rainfall, stand age, and topography on forested landscapes, southwestern Washington, USA. *Forest Ecology and Management* 259 (2010) 2233–2247

<sup>8</sup>Sakals, M.E. and R.C. Sidle. 2004. A spatial and temporal model of root cohesion in forest soils. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 34(4): 950-958.

cutting and strip cutting), clear cutting produces the greatest decline in root cohesion. Further, they found that root cohesion continues to decline for 30 years post-harvest. That decline is attributed to the decay of the root systems of the harvested trees, and the fact that young root systems have smaller root volumes and less radial rooting extent. They concluded that clear cutting on hazard slopes could increase the number of landslides as well as the probability of larger landslides. They also stated that a management approach requiring the retention of conifers on high-risk slopes would increase root cohesion and reduce the risk of landslide.

Not only has the science demonstrated that timber harvesting can contribute to landslides but that these landslides also degrade water quality and impair designated uses in Pacific Northwest streams. In a 2012 paper, Whittaker and McShane cited that:

“In the Pacific Northwest, ... Landslides alter aquatic habitats by elevating sediment delivery, creating log jams, and causing debris flows that scour streams and stream valleys down to bedrock (Rood, 1984; Cederholm and Reid, 1987; Hogan et. al., 1998). The short-term and long-term impacts of higher rates of landslides on fish include habitat loss, reduced access to spawning and rearing sites, loss of food resources, and direct mortality (Cederholm and Lestelle, 1974; Cederholm and Salo, 1979; Reeves et. al., 1995). The restoration of geomorphic processes to natural disturbance regimes is crucial to the recovery of endangered salmonids (*Oncorhynchus* spp.) and other aquatic species in the Pacific Northwest as these species evolved under conditions with much lower sediment delivery and landslide frequency (Reeves et. al., 1995; Montgomery, 2004).”

In 2013, the Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research committee (CMER) of the Washington State Department of Natural Resources published a study that explored landslide response to a large 2007 storm in Southwestern Washington.<sup>9</sup> The primary objective of this project was to evaluate the effectiveness of current Washington Forest Practices Rules at reducing landslide density and sediment delivery to public resources resulting from a major storm event. Within the 91 square mile study area, a total of 1147 landslides were found within harvest units that delivered to public resources (mostly streams). The majority (82%) occurred on hillslopes and the rest initiated from roads. In examining these landslides, the study found that where unstable hillslopes (termed Rule Identified Landforms or RILs) were present within a harvest unit but unprotected by a buffer (i.e. they were clearcut), they experienced a significantly (65%) higher landslide density than did RIL with mature (40-year-old) stands present. Unstable slopes with no buffer also delivered 347% more sediment than slopes with mature stands. The authors conclude that buffers on unstable slopes likely reduce landslide density and sediment volume. This has important implications for water quality and beneficial uses. It is well documented that sediment can clog and damage fish gills, suffocate fish eggs, smother aquatic insect larvae, and fill in spaces in streambed gravel where fish lay eggs<sup>10</sup>. Sediment can also carry other pollutants into waterbodies, creating issues for domestic water supply and public water providers<sup>11</sup>.

---

<sup>9</sup> Stewart, G., Dieu, J., Phillips, J., O'Connor, M., Veldhuisen C., 2013. The Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring Project: An examination of the landslide response to the December 2007 storm in Southwestern Washington; Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Report CMER 08- 802; Washington Department of Natural Resources, Olympia, WA.

<sup>10</sup> Suttle, K.B., M.E. Power, J.M. Levine, C. McNeely. 2004. How fine sediment in riverbeds impairs growth and survival of juvenile salmonids. *Ecological Applications* 14: 969-974.

<sup>11</sup> Department of Environmental Quality. 2011. Water Quality Status and Action Plan: North Coast Basin. Available online at <http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/watershed/Docs/NorthCoastPlan.pdf>

Rule-Identified Landform (RIL): RIL are the potentially unstable slopes recognized by Washington Forest Practices Rules and defined in WAC 222-16-050. Current regulations require RIL be identified prior to harvest or road construction. Forest Practices, to the extent practicable, are designed to avoid management activities on RIL unless the forester and/or regulatory agency staff have determined that there is little potential for sediment delivery to public resources.

In northern California, the North Coast Regional Water Quality Board is currently developing a TMDL to address water quality impairments due to sedimentation in the Elk River watershed. Landslides were identified as a major source of sediment in the North Fork of the river. The main causes of these landslides were: poorly located, constructed, or maintained roads; logging with ground-based systems on steep slopes; harvesting on inherently unstable slopes; temporary reduction in root strength from clear cutting; and legacy problems associated with old skid trails and abandoned roads.<sup>12</sup>

There is abundant evidence that shows clear-cutting increases the rate of landslides and that landslides can effect water quality and beneficial uses. Additional management measures are needed to provide greater protection of landslide prone areas for the protection of water quality in Oregon. To meet this additional management measure requirement, the state could do some or all of the following:

- Adopt similar harvest and road construction restrictions for all high-risk landslide prone areas with the potential to impact water quality and designated uses, not just those areas where landslides pose risks to life and property.
- Use slope instability screening tools that help identify high-risk landslide areas that take into account site-specific factors such as slope, geology and geography and planned land management activities, such as roads development.
- Institute a rule to avoid clear cut logging on certain unstable slopes, recognizing the role of tree roots in maintaining slope stability.
- Make maps of all high-risk landslide areas widely available to foresters to inform harvest planning.
- Ensure that roads are designed, constructed and maintained in such a manner that the risk of triggering slope failure that impacts public safety and water quality is minimized.
- Develop a peer-reviewed process for identifying high-risk areas and unstable slopes based on field review by trained staff. The field review should include an initial watershed scale assessment to identify locations with high risk of landslides or slope failures and the likely impacts of a landslide (e.g., probable increases in sediment inputs) for all type of streams especially segments of anadromous fish streams.

---

<sup>12</sup> Stillwater Sciences, 2007. Landslide Hazard in the Elk River Basin, Humboldt County, California, June 2007

- Develop more robust voluntary programs to encourage and incentivize the use of forestry best management practices to protect high-risk landslide areas that have the potential to impact water quality and designated uses, such as employing no-harvest restrictions around high-risk areas and ensuring that roads are designed, constructed, and maintained in such a manner that the risk of triggering slope failures is minimized.
- Institute a monitoring program to track compliance with the FPA rules and voluntary guidance for high-risk landslide prone areas and the effectiveness of these practices in reducing slope failures.
- Establish an ongoing monitoring program that adequately assesses cause and effects of recent landslides and has specific recommendations for future management. In particular, look for ways to reduce the occurrence of channelized landslides.
- .
- Integrate processes to identify high-risk landslide prone areas and specific best management practices to protect these areas into the TMDL process. For example, in the Mid-Coast Basin, DEQ is currently developing a sediment TMDL to address water quality limited waters for biocriteria, turbidity, and sediment. To support the development of the TMDL, the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Resources completed landslide inventory maps for two watersheds in the Mid-Coast Basin finding hundreds of previously unidentified landslides.<sup>14</sup> As part of the TMDL DEQ will be completing a source assessment of the landslides in relationship to the water quality impairments. NOAA and EPA encourage the state to complete this TMDL and include specific practices that landowners will need to follow to address the issue in the TMDL implementation plans.

If the Oregon plans to rely on voluntary efforts, the state must describe the full suite of voluntary practices it plans to use address this management measure, how the state will promote these voluntary practices, and meet the other requirements when using voluntary programs to meet 6217(g) management measure requirements (i.e., a legal opinion asserting the state has back-up authority to ensure implementation of the management measure, a commitment to use the back-up authority, and a description of the monitoring and tracking program the state will use to assess how it will monitor and track implementation of the voluntary approach.

---

<sup>14</sup> Burns, W. J., Duplantis, S., Jones, C., English, J., 2012. LIDAR Data and Landslide Inventory Maps of the North Fork Siuslaw River and Big Elk Creek Watersheds, Lane, Lincoln and Benton Counties, Oregon. Open-File Report O-12-07, Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries.

**Reminder:** We need to develop a response to the following summary of the public comments received on landslides. We need to make sure we strengthen our rationale to address any apparent weaknesses the public pointed out in our proposed findings.

**Comment:** Some commenters acknowledged that landslides caused by logging practices such as clear cutting are a real problem in Oregon and additional management measures are necessary to address these impacts. It was noted that Oregon does not have sufficient programs in place to control non-point pollution from forestry practices, particularly due to logging on private lands.

Others expressed their disagreement with the federal agencies' recent decision and argued that the evidence provided by the federal entities was misleading, only focusing on "landslide density relationships" rather than considering the "total number of landslides triggered during major storms". If consider the latter, one would see that the "potential increases in sediment delivery to public resources from landslides...is proportionally small". In addition, it was argued that EPA has not offered objective evidence that additional management measures are needed to maintain water quality. It was recommended that EPA consider a broader scale view over longer timeframes to evaluate whether water quality and designated uses are impaired. The commenter added that the federal agencies have not produced any evidence that landslides resulting from forest management activities have caused exceedances in water quality or negatively impacted aquatic life.

## Forestry - Landslide Rationale

Oregon proposes to address this element of the additional management measures for forestry condition through a mix of regulatory and voluntary approaches. While the state has adopted more protective forestry rules to reduce landslide risks to life and property and promotes some voluntary practices to reduce landslide risks through the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds (The Oregon Plan), Oregon still does not have additional management measures for forestry in place to protect high-risk landslide areas to ensure that water quality standards and designated uses are achieved.

Since receiving conditional approval on January 13, 1998, Oregon amended the Oregon FPA rules to require the identification of landslide hazard areas in timber harvesting plans and road construction and placed certain restrictions on harvest and road activities within these designated high-risk landslide areas for public safety (OAR 629-623-0000 through 629-623-0800). However, under these amendments, shallow, rapidly moving landslide hazards directly related to forest practices are addressed only as they relate to risks for losses of life and property, not for potential water quality impacts. Oregon still allows timber harvest and the construction of forest roads, where alternatives are not available, on high-risk landslide hazard areas as long as it is not deemed a public safety risk.

In addition to these regulatory programs, Oregon employs a voluntary measure under the Oregon Plan that gives landowners credit for leaving standing live trees along landslide-prone areas as a source of large wood. The large wood, which may eventually be deposited into fish-

bearing stream channels, contributes to stream complexity, a key limiting factor for coastal coho salmon recovery. While this is a good management practice, the measure is not designed to protect high-risk erosion areas but rather to ensure large wood is available exists to provide additional stream complexity when a landslide occurs. ~~As one of the three elements of a voluntary management measure, the State must provide a description of the monitoring and tracking program it uses to assess the success of this voluntary approach. NOAA and EPA are not aware of an established monitoring program that tracks the frequency or the effectiveness of this practice.~~

**Comment [AC1]:** I don't think this needs to be here. We cover this in the last para and don't need to repeat here.

As noted in the January 13, 1998, findings, timber harvests on unstable, steep terrain can result in increases in landslide rates which contribute to water quality impairments. A number of studies continue to show significant increases in landslide rates after clear cutting compared to unmanaged forests in the Pacific Northwest. For example, Robinson et. al. (1999) found that in three out of four areas studied in very steep terrain, landslide densities and erosion volumes were greater in stands that were clear-cut during the previous nine years.<sup>4</sup> ~~Other evidence indicates that timber harvests on unstable, steep terrain can result in increases in landslide rates of approximately 200 to 400 percent.~~<sup>3</sup> Robinson et al also found that the ratio of the landslide density on recently harvested forests versus unharvested mature forests, ranged from .8 to 5.2.<sup>4</sup>

**Comment [AC2]:** I find this statement a bit confusing for the non-scientists. Not sure presenting ratios adds that much...just reinforces the point made in the prior sentence.

Research by Montgomery et. al. (2000), and Turner et. al. (2010) is also consistent with this finding that timber harvest increases landslide rates. Montgomery et. al. (2000) concluded that landslide rates in Mettman Ridge in the Oregon Coast Range increased after clear cutting at a rate of three to nine times the background rate for the region. The regional analysis from the Mettman Ridge study found that forest clearing dramatically accelerates shallow landsliding in steep terrain typical of the Pacific Northwest.<sup>5</sup> Turner et al. (2010), also found that rain fall intensity, slope steepness, and stand age contributed to landslide rates. Very few landslides occurred when rainfall was less than or equal to a 100-year rainfall event} and at higher rainfall intensities, steep slopes had significantly higher landslide densities compared to lower gradient slopes. In addition, they found that at higher rainfall intensities, the density of landslides in recently harvested sites was roughly two to three times the landslide density in older stands.<sup>6</sup>

Other research has examined the role of root cohesion on landslide susceptibility in forested landscapes. Root cohesion is a measure of the lateral reinforcing strength the root system

<sup>1</sup>Robison, G.R., Mills, K.A., Paul, J., Dent, L. and A. Skaugset. 1999. Oregon Department of Forestry Storm Impacts and Landslides of 1996: Final Report. Oregon Department of Forestry Forest Practices Monitoring Program. Forest Practices Technical Report Number 4. 157 pages.

<sup>2</sup>Robison, G.R., Mills, K.A., Paul, J., Dent, L. and A. Skaugset. 1999. Oregon Department of Forestry Storm Impacts and Landslides of 1996: Final Report. Oregon Department of Forestry Forest Practices Monitoring Program. Forest Practices Technical Report Number 4. 157 pages.

<sup>3</sup> Grant, G.E., "Review of NMFS/ODF White Papers", February 25, 1997

<sup>4</sup>Robison, G.R., Mills, K.A., Paul, J., Dent, L. and A. Skaugset. 1999. Oregon Department of Forestry Storm Impacts and Landslides of 1996: Final Report. Oregon Department of Forestry Forest Practices Monitoring Program. Forest Practices Technical Report Number 4. 157 pages, Table 2, p.8.

<sup>5</sup> Montgomery, D. R., K. M. Schmidt, H. M. Greenberg & W. E. Dietrich, 2000. Forest clearing and regional landsliding. Geology 28: 311-314.

<sup>6</sup> Turner, T.R., Duke, S.D., Fransen, B.R., Reiter, M.L., Kroll, A.J., Ward, J.W., Bach, J.L., Justice, T. E., and R.E. Bilby. 2010. Landslide densities associated with rainfall, stand age, and topography on forested landscapes, southwestern Washington, USA. Forest Ecology and Management 259 (2010) 2233-2247

**Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 8 pt

**Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 8 pt, Not Highlight

**Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 8 pt

**Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 8 pt, Not Highlight

**Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 8 pt

**Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 8 pt

**Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 8 pt, Not Highlight

**Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 8 pt

provides.<sup>7</sup> A The higher the root cohesion, the better the root system can stabilize the soil, reducing the risk of landslides. Schmidt et. al. (2001) found that median lateral root cohesion is less for industrial forests with significant understory and deciduous vegetation (6.8–23.2 kPa) compared to natural forests dominated by conifers (25.6–94.3 kPa). In clearcuts, Schmidt et. al. found that lateral root cohesion is uniformly less than or equal to 10 kPa, making these areas much more susceptible to landslide.

Sakals and Sidle (2004) modeled the effect of different harvest methodologies on root cohesion over time.<sup>8</sup> They found that, of the methodologies examined, (clear cutting, single tree selection cutting and strip cutting), clear cutting produces the greatest decline in root cohesion. Further, they found that root cohesion may continues to decline for 30 years post-harvest. That decline is attributed to the decay of the root systems of the harvested trees, and the fact that young root systems have smaller root volumes and less radial rooting extent. They concluded that clear cutting on hazard slopes could increase the number of landslides as well as the probability of larger landslides. They also stated that a management approach requiring the retention of conifers on high-risk slopes would increase root cohesion and reduce the risk of landslide.

Not only has the science demonstrated that timber harvesting can contribute to landslides but that these landslides also degrade water quality and impair designated uses in Pacific Northwest streams the Pacific Northwest. In a 2012 paper, Whittaker and McShane cited that:

"In the Pacific Northwest, ... Landslides alter aquatic habitats by elevating sediment delivery, creating log jams, and causing debris flows that scour streams and stream valleys down to bedrock (Rood, 1984; Cederholm and Reid, 1987; Hogan et. al., 1998). The short-term and long-term impacts of higher rates of landslides on fish include habitat loss, reduced access to spawning and rearing sites, loss of food resources, and direct mortality (Cederholm and Lestelle, 1974; Cederholm and Salo, 1979; Reeves et. al., 1995). The restoration of geomorphic processes to natural disturbance regimes is crucial to the recovery of endangered salmonids (*Oncorhynchus* spp.) and other aquatic species in the Pacific Northwest as these species evolved under conditions with much lower sediment delivery and landslide frequency (Reeves et. al., 1995; Montgomery, 2004)."

In 2013, the Cooperative Monitoring Evaluation and Research committee (CMER) of the Washington State Department of Natural Resources published a study that explored landslide response to a large 2007 storm in Southwestern Washington.<sup>9</sup> The primary objective of this project was to evaluate the effectiveness of current Washington Forest Practices Rules at reducing landslide density and sediment delivery to public resources resulting from a major storm event. Within the 91 square mile study area, a total of 1147 landslides were found within harvest units that delivered to public resources (mostly streams). The majority (82%) occurred on hillslopes and the rest initiated from roads. In examining these landslides, the study found that where unstable hillslopes (termed Rule Identified Landforms or RILs) were present

**Comment [AC3]:** I don't think we need to site an explanation of the term that is understood within the scientific community.

**Comment [HA4R3]:** I agree in principle, but it may not be clear to the management team, the sentence is short and to the point and is well made. I suggest we leave it in.

**Comment [AC5R4]:** I think the definitional sentence is great but my comment was just that we don't need to give anyone credit for that definition. We don't have to cite Webster's when we define another word. Everyone "owns" definitions.

**Comment [AC6]:** What other methodologies were examined? Would adopted one of the other methodologies be a bmp we'd want to promote?

**Comment [HA7R6]:** I will find the study and add specific information about the other methods considered.

**Comment [AC8]:** Can we say this more definitively or did they really only conclude it "may" decline?

**Comment [AC9]:** Talked with the research expert in my office that used to work at NSF and she said this was an acceptable way to reference it so retract my early statement that perhaps we need to paraphrase.

**Comment [HA10R9]:** OK

**Comment [AC11]:** Not sure we need these sentences since we've cited our on, more recent research to support this point.

**Formatted:** Widow/Orphan control

<sup>7</sup> Wu, T.H. 1995. Slope stabilization. In *Slope stabilization and erosion control: A bioengineering approach*. Edited by R.P.C. Morgan and R.J. Rickson. E & FN Spon, London, pp. 221–264.

<sup>8</sup> Sakals, M.E. and R.C. Sidle. 2004. A spatial and temporal model of root cohesion in forest soils. *Canadian Journal of Forest Research* 34(4): 950-958.

<sup>9</sup> Stewart, G., Dieu, J., Phillips, J., O'Connor, M., Veldhuisen C., 2013. The Mass Wasting Effectiveness Monitoring Project: An examination of the landslide response to the December 2007 storm in Southwestern Washington; Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation and Research Report CMER 08- 802; Washington Department of Natural Resources, Olympia, WA.



within a harvest unit but unprotected by a buffer (i.e. they were clearcut), they with no buffer had experienced a significantly (65%) higher landslide density than did RIL with mature (40-year-old) stands present. Unstable slopes with no buffer also delivered 347% more sediment than slopes with mature stands. The authors conclude that buffers on unstable slopes likely reduce landslide density and sediment volume. This has important implications for water quality and beneficial uses. It is well documented that sediment can clog and damage fish gills, suffocate fish eggs, smother aquatic insect larvae, and fill in spaces in streambed gravel where fish lay eggs<sup>10</sup>. Sediment can also carry other pollutants into waterbodies, creating issues for domestic water supply and public water providers<sup>11</sup>.

**Comment [AC12]:** This is a little confusing to me. Have these unstable hillslopes been harvested? Otherwise, not sure the comparison to “mature stands”...what makes then different than “mature stands”?

**Comment [KT13R12]:** Added some language to hopefully clarify.

Rule-Identified Landform (RIL): RIL are the potentially unstable slopes recognized by Washington Forest Practices Rules and defined in WAC 222-16-050. Current regulations require RIL be identified prior to harvest or road construction. Forest Practices, to the extent practicable, are designed to avoid management activities on RIL unless the forester and/or regulatory agency staff have determined that there is little potential for sediment delivery to public resources.

**Comment [AC14]:** Is this was the CMER study stated/concluded? If so, would be good to acknowledge. If this is your analysis, then we need to provide citations to back up these statements.

**Comment [KT15R14]:** The CMER study says that sediment delivered from landslides can negatively affect aquatic resources, but they don't go beyond that. I have added a couple of citations to support these statements.

**Comment [AC16]:** I think this section can be streamlined. Also, still on the fence if it's helpful to include or not since it calls attention to the fact that we don't have TMDLs yet in OR that provide this link. I still think we are justified for include add MM for landslides under 6217(b)(1)(B): “those coastal waters that are threatened by reasonably foreseeable increases in pollution loadings from new or expanding sources”

In northern California, the North Coast Regional Water Quality Board is currently developing a TMDL to address water quality impairments due to sedimentation in the Elk River watershed. Landslides were identified as a major source of sediment in the North Fork of the river. The main causes of these landslides were: poorly located, constructed, or maintained roads; logging with ground-based systems on steep slopes; harvesting on inherently unstable slopes; temporary reduction in root strength from clear cutting; and legacy problems associated with old skid trails and abandoned roads.<sup>12</sup>

**Comment [HA17R16]:** I was trying to demonstrate the fact that landslides, can be anthropogenically initiated and do result in water quality standards violations. I will try to streamline this. Also, I do like the idea of tying this to 6217(b)(1)(B) but have we used this before in any of our other decisions? Jenny recently sent me some info. Re: landslides in OR. I will see if some of that info. works here.

There is abundant evidence that shows clear-cutting increases the rate of landslides and that landslides can effect water quality and beneficial uses. In the Mid-Coast Basin in Oregon, DEQ is currently developing a sediment TMDL to address water quality limited waters for biocriteria, turbidity and sediment. To support the development of the TMDL, the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Resources completed landslide inventory maps for two watersheds in the Mid-Coast Basin finding hundreds of previously unidentified landslides.<sup>13</sup> As part of the TMDL DEQ will be completing a source assessment of the landslides in relationship to the water quality impairments.

**Comment [AC18R17]:** I'm still not sure this is needed. I think the research provided above drives home the anthropogenic point and keeping it just draws attention to the fact that landslides are not yet specifically links to wsq violations in OR.

**Comment [AC19]:** Not sure this adds value...see comment above.

**Comment [AC20]:** This seems a bit out of place here. Perhaps its more suitable for a recommendation...encourage OR to complete this Mid-Coast TMDL that identifies high-risk areas and includes BMPs to address in implementation plans.

<sup>10</sup> Suttle, K.B., M.E. Power, J.M. Levine, C. McNeely. 2004. How fine sediment in riverbeds impairs growth and survival of juvenile salmonids. *Ecological Applications* 14: 969-974.

<sup>11</sup> Department of Environmental Quality. 2011. Water Quality Status and Action Plan: North Coast Basin. Available online at <http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/watershed/Docs/NorthCoastPlan.pdf>

<sup>12</sup> Stillwater Sciences. 2007. “Landslide Hazard in the Elk River Basin, Humboldt County, California”, June 2007.

<sup>13</sup> Burns, W. J., Duplantis, S., Jones, C., English, J., 2012, “LIDAR Data and Landslide Inventory Maps of the North Fork Siuslaw River and Big Elk Creek Watersheds, Lane, Lincoln and Benton Counties, Oregon”, Open File Report O-12-07, Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries

**Formatted:** Font: (Default) Calibri, 8 pt

**Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 8 pt

**Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 8 pt

There is abundant evidence that shows clear-cutting increases the rate of landslides and that landslides can effect water quality and beneficial uses. ~~Additional management measures are needed to provide greater protection of landslide prone areas for the protection of water quality in Oregon. To meet this additional management measure requirement, the state must could do some or all of the following:~~

- ~~• a~~Adopt similar harvest and road construction restrictions for all high-risk landslide prone areas with the potential to impact water quality and designated uses, not just those areas where landslides pose risks to life and property.
- ~~• The state may want to consider u~~Using slope instability screening tools that help identify high-risk landslide areas~~These restrictions that take into account could be s~~ite-specific taking into account factors such as slope, geology and geography on existing ~~or~~and planned land management activities, such as roads development.

- Institute a rule to avoid clear cut logging on certain unstable slopes, recognizing the role of tree roots in maintaining slope stability.

- Make maps of all high-risk landslide areas widely available to foresters to inform harvest planning.

- Ensure that roads are designed, constructed and maintained in such a manner that the risk of triggering slope failure that impacts public safety and water quality is minimized.

~~The State should consider establishing the following steps to address this management measure:~~

- ~~• The state may also want to consider using slope instability screening tools that help identify high-risk landslide areas~~Develop a peer-reviewed process for identifying high-risk areas and unstable slopes based on field review by trained staff. The field review should include an initial watershed scale assessment to identify locations with high risk of landslides or slope failures and the likely impacts of a landslide (e.g., probable increases in sediment inputs) for all type of streams especially segments of anadromous fish streams. ~~to minimize landslide rates and potential impacts to water quality and beneficial uses~~

~~Institute a rule to avoid clearcut logging on certain unstable slopes, recognizing the role of tree roots in maintaining slope stability.~~

- Develop more robust voluntary programs to encourage and incentivize the use of forestry best management practices to protect high-risk landslide areas that have the potential to impact water quality and designated uses, such employing no-harvest restrictions around high-risk areas and ensuring that roads are designed, constructed, and maintained in such a manner that the risk of triggering slope failures is minimized.

- Institute a monitoring program to track ~~Monitor BMP application for both~~ compliance with the ~~Rules~~FPA rules and voluntary guidance for high-risk landslide prone areas and the effectiveness of these pratices in reducing ~~the potential for~~ slope failures.

**Formatted:** Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering, No widow/orphan control, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers

## Ex. 5 - Deliberative

**Formatted:** Font: Font color: Auto

**Formatted:** Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt, No bullets or numbering, No widow/orphan control, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers

**Formatted:** Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5", No widow/orphan control, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers

**Formatted:** Font: Font color: Auto

**Formatted:** List Paragraph, No bullets or numbering, Widow/Orphan control, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers

**Formatted** ... [1]

**Formatted:** Font: Font color: Auto

**Formatted** ... [2]

**Formatted** ... [3]

**Formatted:** Font: Font color: Auto

**Formatted** ... [4]

**Formatted** ... [5]

**Formatted** ... [6]

**Comment [AC22]:** How does this bullet relate to above bullet on slope stability tools. Seems like they are one in the same or th ... [7]

**Comment [AC23]:** This is covered by rule change suggestion above.

~~Ensure that roads are designed, constructed, and maintained in such a manner that the risk of triggering slope failures is minimized.~~

- ~~Establish an ongoing monitoring program that adequately assesses cause and effects of recent landslides and has specific recommendations for future management. In particular, look for ways to reduce the occurrence of channelized landslides.~~
- ~~Monitor slope failures within a representative basin, or within each major geologic type.~~
- ~~Integrate processes to identify high-risk landslide prone areas and specific best management practices to protect these areas into the TMDL process. –For example, in the Mid-Coast Basin, DEQ is currently developing a sediment TMDL to address water quality limited waters for biocriteria, turbidity, and sediment. To support the development of the TMDL, the Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Resources completed landslide inventory maps for two watersheds in the Mid-Coast Basin finding hundreds of previously unidentified landslides.<sup>14</sup> As part of the TMDL DEQ will be completing a source assessment of the landslides in relationship to the water quality impairments. NOAA and EPA encourage the state to complete this TMDL and include specific practices that landowners will need to follow to address the issue in the TMDL implementation plans.~~

**Comment [AC24]:** How is this different than the above bullet? What will this type of monitoring achieve. In a perfect world, with unlimited funds, would be fantastic to have all this monitoring but also need to be realistic in what may be achievable and most important in the state.

If the Oregon plans to rely on voluntary efforts, the state must describe the full suite of voluntary practices it plans to use address this management measure, how the state will promote these voluntary practices, and meet the other requirements when using voluntary programs to meet 6217(g) management measure requirements (i.e., a legal opinion asserting the state has back-up authority to ensure implementation of the management measure, a commitment to use the back-up authority, and a description of the monitoring and tracking program the state will use to assess how it will monitor and track implementation of the voluntary approach.

**Comment [AC25]:** But what are the bmps that they should use once the high-risk areas are identified?

**Comment [HA26R25]:** Need to do some more homework here.

<sup>14</sup> Burns, W. J., Duplantis, S., Jones, C., English, J., 2012, LIDAR Data and Landslide Inventory Maps of the North Fork Siuslaw River and Big Elk Creek Watersheds, Lane, Lincoln and Benton Counties, Oregon, Open-File Report O-12-07, Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries.

**Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 8 pt

**Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 8 pt

**Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 8 pt

**Formatted:** Font: Calibri, 8 pt

**Page 5: [1] Formatted**

**Allison Castellan**

**9/8/2014 12:40:00 PM**

Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5", No widow/orphan control, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers

**Page 5: [2] Formatted**

**Henning, Alan**

**9/12/2014 11:56:00 AM**

List Paragraph, No bullets or numbering, Widow/Orphan control, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers

**Page 5: [3] Formatted**

**Allison Castellan**

**9/8/2014 12:40:00 PM**

Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5", No widow/orphan control, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers

**Page 5: [4] Formatted**

**Henning, Alan**

**9/12/2014 11:58:00 AM**

List Paragraph, No bullets or numbering, Widow/Orphan control, Adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Adjust space between Asian text and numbers

**Page 5: [5] Formatted**

**Allison Castellan**

**9/8/2014 12:40:00 PM**

Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt, Bulleted + Level: 1 + Aligned at: 0.25" + Indent at: 0.5", No widow/orphan control, Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Don't adjust space between Asian text and numbers

**Page 5: [6] Formatted**

**Henning, Alan**

**9/5/2014 6:00:00 PM**

Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: Bullet + Aligned at: 0.25" + Tab after: 0.5" + Indent at: 0.5"

**Page 5: [7] Comment [AC22]**

**Allison Castellan**

**9/8/2014 12:55:00 PM**

How does this bullet relate to above bullet on slope stability tools. Seems like they are one in the same or this bullet is an example of a type of screening tool? Perhaps benefit from combining the two bullets or at least revising to show connection?